

Remarks

According to Examiner, claims 1-3 and 5-6 were anticipated by Peterson US Pat No. RE 37296 (5,342,221). Examiner argued that Figure 3 discloses various combinations and Figures 1-2 disclose selecting steps. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the following reasons.

First of all, Peterson never clearly and explicitly disclosed how the connectors shown in Figures 1, 2 and 3 were configured. Peterson only disclosed a RESULT in which connector with one number cannot interconnect with connector of the other numbers, but never discloses and teaches the public HOW they were configured. Accordingly, none of the public can ever make another set of connectors other than Figure 3, in which connectors of different numbers can not be interchangeable to each other. Connectors disclosed in Figure 3 were the ONLY embodiments disclosed by Peterson.

It is believed that when Peterson was first published on August 30, 1994, the connector industry was puzzled as only a Result was disclosed, while no reason was given for how it worked. It is applicant's own effort by reviewing Peterson, as well as other prior art, such as Mini-Fit Jr, and Mini-Fit BM 1, that applicant therefore figured out a method of making connectors which cannot interconnect with each other. Accordingly, by the disclosure of the present invention, the public now clearly understands how to arrange a keying system in connectors such that a connector with one number cannot interconnect connector with another number. For example, the configuration of two flattened corners as disclosed in Mini-Fit was once believed that it could not be used to create a keying system. Nevertheless, by the method disclosed by the present invention, the skill in the connector arts can easily arrange a connector.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Most importantly, if a skilled in the art person would like to make a Three-Row connector system in which a 3x3 connector can not interconnect with a 3x7 connector, he/she could not learn this from Peterson. As a matter of fact, none of those skilled in the art will figure out how to make it in view of Figure 3 of Peterson, however, the skilled in the art person can easily figure out and make one according to the disclosure of the present invention. Because the present invention teaches a method of configuring connectors by Units! Only when viewing from a Unit viewpoint, those skilled in the art can make their own and unique system. Accordingly, if Peterson can not teach and suggest how to make a connector such as the present invention teaches, how can it anticipate claims of the present invention?

Even to the 2x2 embodiments, as to Figure 3 of the Peterson, none of those skilled in the art has come out with another set. However, by the disclosure of the present invention, any person skilled in the art can make thousands of thousands of different embodiments according to their own requirements. While Peterson disclosed only a single set of embodiments, applicant discloses a whole universe! If Peterson cannot enable those skilled in the art to make another set of connectors, then how it can anticipate claims of the present invention? Accordingly, rejection to claims 1-3, and 5-6 in view of Peterson was respectfully traversed because Peterson failed to disclose a disclosure anticipating claims 1-3 and 5-6 of the present invention. It is suggested that the Examiner reconsider from the view point of those skilled in the art.

Claim 4 was rejected as being obvious in view of Peterson's disclosure. Applicant respectfully traverses this argument. As applicant explains above, the connector with two flattened corners were once believed cannot prevent "mismatching" by those skilled in the

art, however, by the disclose of the present invention, it becomes a real embodiment that connectors with two flattened corners can also prevent "mismatching". If something was believed impossible by those skilled in the art, while applicant successfully makes it possible, applicant humbly believes this is not obvious!

Accordingly, claims 1-3 and 5-6 patentably define over Peterson. Reconsideration and issuance to the claims above is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted



Cheng, Andrew

22928 Estoril Drive, Apartment 5

Diamond Bar, CA 91765